



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/039,035	01/04/2002	Nicholas P. Wilt	MSFT-0740/177740.01	2351
41505	7590	09/11/2006	EXAMINER	
WOODCOCK WASHBURN LLP (MICROSOFT CORPORATION)			DAO, THUY CHAN	
ONE LIBERTY PLACE - 46TH FLOOR				
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2192	

DATE MAILED: 09/11/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Interview Summary	Application No. 10/039,035	Applicant(s) WILT ET AL.	
	Examiner Thuy Dao	Art Unit 2192	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Mr. Swope (Reg. No. 38,041). (3) _____.

(2) Thuy Dao. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 05 September 2006.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.


Identification of prior art discussed: US Patent No. 6,769,115 (Oldman).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: the Examiner respectfully request the Applicants distinguish the claimed limitations over the prior art (at least distinguishing the intermediate language (IL) in claim 1 over the object code in the reference).

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.


TUAN DAM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Summary of Record of Interview Requirements

Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP), Section 713.04, Substance of Interview Must be Made of Record

A complete written statement as to the substance of any face-to-face, video conference, or telephone interview with regard to an application must be made of record in the application whether or not an agreement with the examiner was reached at the interview.

Title 37 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 1.133 Interviews

Paragraph (b)

In every instance where reconsideration is requested in view of an interview with an examiner, a complete written statement of the reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action must be filed by the applicant. An interview does not remove the necessity for reply to Office action as specified in §§ 1.111, 1.135. (35 U.S.C. 132)

37 CFR §1.2 Business to be transacted in writing.

All business with the Patent or Trademark Office should be transacted in writing. The personal attendance of applicants or their attorneys or agents at the Patent and Trademark Office is unnecessary. The action of the Patent and Trademark Office will be based exclusively on the written record in the Office. No attention will be paid to any alleged oral promise, stipulation, or understanding in relation to which there is disagreement or doubt.

The action of the Patent and Trademark Office cannot be based exclusively on the written record in the Office if that record is itself incomplete through the failure to record the substance of interviews.

It is the responsibility of the applicant or the attorney or agent to make the substance of an interview of record in the application file, unless the examiner indicates he or she will do so. It is the examiner's responsibility to see that such a record is made and to correct material inaccuracies which bear directly on the question of patentability.

Examiners must complete an Interview Summary Form for each interview held where a matter of substance has been discussed during the interview by checking the appropriate boxes and filling in the blanks. Discussions regarding only procedural matters, directed solely to restriction requirements for which interview recordation is otherwise provided for in Section 812.01 of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, or pointing out typographical errors or unreadable script in Office actions or the like, are excluded from the interview recordation procedures below. Where the substance of an interview is completely recorded in an Examiners Amendment, no separate Interview Summary Record is required.

The Interview Summary Form shall be given an appropriate Paper No., placed in the right hand portion of the file, and listed on the "Contents" section of the file wrapper. In a personal interview, a duplicate of the Form is given to the applicant (or attorney or agent) at the conclusion of the interview. In the case of a telephone or video-conference interview, the copy is mailed to the applicant's correspondence address either with or prior to the next official communication. If additional correspondence from the examiner is not likely before an allowance or if other circumstances dictate, the Form should be mailed promptly after the interview rather than with the next official communication.

The Form provides for recordation of the following information:

- Application Number (Series Code and Serial Number)
- Name of applicant
- Name of examiner
- Date of interview
- Type of interview (telephonic, video-conference, or personal)
- Name of participant(s) (applicant, attorney or agent, examiner, other PTO personnel, etc.)
- An indication whether or not an exhibit was shown or a demonstration conducted
- An identification of the specific prior art discussed
- An indication whether an agreement was reached and if so, a description of the general nature of the agreement (may be by attachment of a copy of amendments or claims agreed as being allowable). Note: Agreement as to allowability is tentative and does not restrict further action by the examiner to the contrary.
- The signature of the examiner who conducted the interview (if Form is not an attachment to a signed Office action)

It is desirable that the examiner orally remind the applicant of his or her obligation to record the substance of the interview of each case. It should be noted, however, that the Interview Summary Form will not normally be considered a complete and proper recordation of the interview unless it includes, or is supplemented by the applicant or the examiner to include, all of the applicable items required below concerning the substance of the interview.

A complete and proper recordation of the substance of any interview should include at least the following applicable items:

- 1) A brief description of the nature of any exhibit shown or any demonstration conducted,
- 2) an identification of the claims discussed,
- 3) an identification of the specific prior art discussed,
- 4) an identification of the principal proposed amendments of a substantive nature discussed, unless these are already described on the Interview Summary Form completed by the Examiner,
- 5) a brief identification of the general thrust of the principal arguments presented to the examiner,
(The identification of arguments need not be lengthy or elaborate. A verbatim or highly detailed description of the arguments is not required. The identification of the arguments is sufficient if the general nature or thrust of the principal arguments made to the examiner can be understood in the context of the application file. Of course, the applicant may desire to emphasize and fully describe those arguments which he or she feels were or might be persuasive to the examiner.)
- 6) a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed, and
- 7) if appropriate, the general results or outcome of the interview unless already described in the Interview Summary Form completed by the examiner.

Examiners are expected to carefully review the applicant's record of the substance of an interview. If the record is not complete and accurate, the examiner will give the applicant an extendable one month time period to correct the record.

Examiner to Check for Accuracy

If the claims are allowable for other reasons of record, the examiner should send a letter setting forth the examiner's version of the statement attributed to him or her. If the record is complete and accurate, the examiner should place the indication, "Interview Record OK" on the paper recording the substance of the interview along with the date and the examiner's initials.



FACSIMILE

PHILADELPHIA

One Liberty Place, 46th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19103
215-568-3100
Fax: 215-568-3439

SEATTLE

899 Third Avenue, Suite 1606
Seattle, WA 98104
206-332-1380
Fax: 206-624-7317

DATE: August 29, 2006
OFFICIAL PAPER

JOB CODE: 292872

Please deliver this and the following pages to:

Examiner: **Thuy Chan Dao**
U.S.P.T.O. Group Art Unit: **2351**
Telecopier No.: **571-273-8570**
U.S. Serial No.: **10/039,035**
Client/Matter No.: **MSFT-0740**
Sender's Name: **Christina Laigo on behalf of Michael J. Swope**
Pages to Follow: **2**

If transmission is not complete, please call our **Seattle Office** at (206) 332-1380.

COVER MESSAGE:

OFFICIAL FACSIMILE. PLEASE DELIVER TO EXAMINER IMMEDIATELY.

Claims 1-2, 6-10, 15-19, and 24-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Admitted Prior Art (APA) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,769,115 to Oldman. With respect to claim 1, the examiner indicates that the APA discloses *a computer system, comprising:*

- a processor (e.g., page 2: 2-10);
- an operating system having a selected driver that interacts with a computing component (e.g., page 1: 7-13);

THIS MESSAGE IS INTENDED ONLY FOR THE USE OF THE INDIVIDUAL OR ENTITY TO WHICH IT IS ADDRESSED AND MAY CONTAIN INFORMATION THAT IS PRIVILEGED, CONFIDENTIAL AND EXEMPT FROM DISCLOSURE UNDER APPLICABLE LAW. IF THE READER OF THIS MESSAGE IS NOT THE INTENDED RECIPIENT, OR THE EMPLOYEE OR AGENT RESPONSIBLE FOR DELIVERY OF THE MESSAGE TO THE INTENDED RECIPIENT, YOU ARE HEREBY NOTIFIED THAT ANY DISSEMINATION, DISTRIBUTION OR COPYING OF THIS COMMUNICATION IS STRICTLY PROHIBITED. IF YOU HAVE RECEIVED THIS COMMUNICATION IN ERROR, PLEASE NOTIFY US IMMEDIATELY BY TELEPHONE AND RETURN THE ORIGINAL TO US AT THE ABOVE ADDRESS VIA THE U.S. POSTAL SERVICE. THANK YOU.

WOODCOCK WASHBURN LLP
A Partnership Including Professional Corporations
www.woodcock.com



FACSIMILE

PHILADELPHIA
One Liberty Place, 48th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19103
215-568-3100
Fax: 215-568-3439
SEATTLE
999 Third Avenue, Suite 1606
Seattle, WA 98104
206-332-1380
Fax: 206-624-7317

a plurality of application instructions (e.g., page 1: 27-28), said instructions being in an intermediate language readable by an intermediate language compiler (e.g., page 2:11-16);

a plurality of runtime instructions, said instructions being in an intermediate language readable by an intermediate language compiler (e.g., page 1: 21-26); and

an intermediate language compiler (e.g., page 2: 11-17).

Action p. 5.

The examiner then indicates that the APA does not explicitly disclose "[said intermediate language compiler] compiles the application instructions and the runtime instructions into instructions executable by the processor for interacting with the selected driver." Nevertheless that examiner contends that Oldman discloses "[said intermediate language compiler] compiles the application instructions and the runtime instructions into instructions executable by the processor for interacting with the selected driver" citing (e.g., FIG. 3, compiling Application Source 103 and Adl Headers 105 and Libraries 106 into Application Binary 107(a-c), and related text in col.6: 50 - col.7: 9). Action p. 5. Applicants respectfully disagree with the examiner's characterization of the cited passage of Oldman.

Oldman does not teach an intermediate language compiler as claimed by the applicant. Rather Oldman teaches a compiler:

specific to the high-level language in which application source 103 is written and to the development platform 121 upon which application source 103 is begin developed. Compiler 107 compiles application source 103 to produce application binaries 113, which will execute on platform 121.

For at least the foregoing reasons, independent claims 1 patentably defines over APA in view of Oldman. Regarding independent claims 9 and 18, the examiner reiterated the rejection of claim

THIS MESSAGE IS INTENDED ONLY FOR THE USE OF THE INDIVIDUAL OR ENTITY TO WHICH IT IS ADDRESSED AND MAY CONTAIN INFORMATION THAT IS PRIVILEGED, CONFIDENTIAL AND EXEMPT FROM DISCLOSURE UNDER APPLICABLE LAW. IF THE READER OF THIS MESSAGE IS NOT THE INTENDED RECIPIENT, OR THE EMPLOYEE OR AGENT RESPONSIBLE FOR DELIVERY OF THE MESSAGE TO THE INTENDED RECIPIENT, YOU ARE HEREBY NOTIFIED THAT ANY DISSEMINATION, DISTRIBUTION OR COPYING OF THIS COMMUNICATION IS STRICTLY PROHIBITED. IF YOU HAVE RECEIVED THIS COMMUNICATION IN ERROR, PLEASE NOTIFY US IMMEDIATELY BY TELEPHONE AND RETURN THE ORIGINAL TO US AT THE ABOVE ADDRESS VIA THE U.S. POSTAL SERVICE. THANK YOU.

WOODCOCK WASHBURN LLP
A Partnership Including Professional Corporations
www.woodcock.com



FACSIMILE

PHILADELPHIA

One Liberty Place, 46th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19103
215-568-3100
Fax: 215-568-3439

SEATTLE

999 Third Avenue, Suite 1606
Seattle, WA 98104
206-332-1380
Fax: 206-624-7317

1. Accordingly, Applicants submit that those claims also patentably define over APA in view of Oldman.

Inasmuch as claims 2-8, 10-17 and 19-26 depend from claims 1, 9 and 18, Applicants submit that they also patentably define over the cited references at least for the same reasons.

Regards,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read 'Michael J. Swope'.

Michael J. Swope

THIS MESSAGE IS INTENDED ONLY FOR THE USE OF THE INDIVIDUAL OR ENTITY TO WHICH IT IS ADDRESSED AND MAY CONTAIN INFORMATION THAT IS PRIVILEGED, CONFIDENTIAL AND EXEMPT FROM DISCLOSURE UNDER APPLICABLE LAW. IF THE READER OF THIS MESSAGE IS NOT THE INTENDED RECIPIENT, OR THE EMPLOYEE OR AGENT RESPONSIBLE FOR DELIVERY OF THE MESSAGE TO THE INTENDED RECIPIENT, YOU ARE HEREBY NOTIFIED THAT ANY DISSEMINATION, DISTRIBUTION OR COPYING OF THIS COMMUNICATION IS STRICTLY PROHIBITED. IF YOU HAVE RECEIVED THIS COMMUNICATION IN ERROR, PLEASE NOTIFY US IMMEDIATELY BY TELEPHONE AND RETURN THE ORIGINAL TO US AT THE ABOVE ADDRESS VIA THE U.S. POSTAL SERVICE. THANK YOU.

WOODCOCK WASHBURN LLP
A Partnership Including Professional Corporations
www.woodcock.com